



**Department of Information Resources
TexasOnline 2.0
Request for Offer DIR-TXO-001**

Addendum #5

This Addendum to Request for Offer DIR-TXO-001 contains a revision to RFO Section 4.3.1 extending the due dates for answering second round questions and Offer submission, a revision to RFO Section 4.7.3.8 References, a revision to RFO Section 4.13.1 extending the Resource Room schedule, the addition of Appendix F.13, and Official Answers to the majority of the Vendor Questions submitted in the second round of questions in accordance with Section 4.3.3 of the RFO.

- **Revision to RFO**

1. Table 4.3.1 is deleted and replaced in its entirety with:

Date/Time	Activity
October 17, 2008	Publish RFO on Electronic State Business Daily
October 28, 2008 10:00 a.m. (CDT)	Deadline for submitting first round of questions for Vendor Conference
October 30, 2008 10:00 a.m. (CDT)	Mandatory Vendor Conference and optional live webcast
November 6, 2008 5:00 p.m. (CST)	Deadline for submitting first round questions
November 18, 2008 5:00 p.m. (CST)	Deadline for answering first round questions
December 4, 2008 5:00 p.m. (CST)	Deadline for submitting second round questions
December 19, 2008 5:00 p.m. (CST)	Deadline for answering second round questions
January 15, 2009 2:00 p.m. (CST)	Deadline for submitting Offers to RFO
January 16, 2009 – until completed	Evaluation of Offers, negotiation, and Contract execution
June 1, 2009	Tentative Agreement Award Date

2. Section 4.7.3.8 References, second paragraph has been deleted and replaced with:

In addition to the detailed five references, Vendors must also submit a client list for contracts requiring performance in the United States, signed within the last four years (2005 through 2008) and with a contract value of \$10 million or more. This client list must include a contact name and contact information (title, telephone number, e-mail address and physical address) for each contract identified in the client list.

3. Section 4.13.1 Resource Room Location and Schedule, second paragraph, first sentence has been deleted and replaced with:



**Department of Information Resources
TexasOnline 2.0
Request for Offer DIR-TXO-001**

Addendum #5

The TexasOnline 2.0 Resource Room will be available October 23, 2008, through November 20, 2008, and December 2, 2008, through December 22, 2008, from 1:00–4:00 pm, Central Time.

• **Questions and Answers**

Many of the questions submitted in the second round required information from the Current Contractor. Answers are subject to verification by Vendor during the due diligence process. A few of the submitted questions will require more time to answer. Answers will be posted to the ESD for the remaining questions on or before December 19, 2008.

1. Section 2.4.1, Core Requirements, requirement #7 states that financial mechanisms and accounting procedures must be established to manage TexasOnline 2.0 financial operations, including migrating historical financial information from the Current Contracts. Regarding the migration of historical financial information, please provide the name and version of the general ledger software used by the Current Contractor.

Answer: The Current Contractor uses Great Plains Version 10.0.

2. Please provide a complete list of the TOL software (customized software applications, infrastructure and other software tools with version numbers, etc.) that would be transitioned from the Current Contractor to an incoming Vendor under this contract.

Answer: The current Asset Inventory will be made available in the Resource Room. Resource Room access will be extended through December 22 to provide ample time for viewing this document. Vendors are advised that the in-scope assets on this list will transition to Team for Texas.

TexasOnline applications are listed in F.7(b). TexasOnline customized applications are considered part of TexasOnline and will transition to TexasOnline 2.0.

Further information will be provided to the awarded Vendor during a due diligence process.

3. Please provide additional information related to TexasOnline's existing content management approach that will assist in documenting a migration plan to a content management system. Specifically, please provide available information regarding templates, taxonomy, content structure, content development, metadata structures and tagging.

Answer: The Vendor should assume no automated content management system is currently used.



Department of Information Resources
TexasOnline 2.0
Request for Offer DIR-TXO-001

Addendum #5

4. At this time, does DIR or the Current Contractor maintain an enterprise-wide intranet for use by agencies in the State of Texas? If so, please provide details regarding the functionality and technology behind the current enterprise-wide intranet deployment.

Answer: No, there is not currently an enterprise-wide intranet for State agencies.

5. Please describe the State's expectation for project management tools that will be delivered through the collaboration platform.

Answer: DIR expects the Vendor to propose tools that could be leveraged by Customers to add value to the State. Specific offerings are to be determined by the Vendor.

6. Based upon our review of Monthly Financial Reports, TexasOnline is currently using Autonomy as its navigation system. Please confirm that TexasOnline uses Autonomy for search today. Does this solution index all agency information, regardless of URL and/or hosting location? Also, related to a previous question, will this solution be licensed to an incoming Vendor?

Answer: Autonomy is used as the current navigation system. Yes, this solution indexes all agency information, regardless of URL and/or hosting location. The Vendor may assume that Autonomy is out-of-scope (DCS) software. The Vendor may choose to license this product for TexasOnline 2.0 or provide another solution.

7. How many unique merchant accounts, including those maintained by individual agencies, are currently associated with TexasOnline services? Please provide the name of the merchant services provider for each account.

Answer: 1,398 unique merchant accounts processing through TexasOnline. This count does not include merchant accounts agencies may have acquired external to TexasOnline. The merchant services provider is Global Payments.

8. The Operations Reports include a number of ePay-like product names. Please provide the differences, if any, between the applications labeled:

- "ePay"
- "ePay Direct"
- "ePay01"
- "ePay02"
- "epayapp01"
- "epayapp10"
- "PayGateway"
- "EBPP"

Answer: ePay, ePay Direct and PayGateway definitions have been provided and are available in the ePay Payment Services Specifications documents in the Resource Room.



Department of Information Resources
TexasOnline 2.0
Request for Offer DIR-TXO-001

Addendum #5

ePay01, ePay02, epayapp01 and epayapp10 are servers.

EBPP is not an ePay specific term, rather it is an application that utilizes ePay.

9. There is a requirement that any financial processing system must support all current processes and procedures. Specifically, what e-check/ACH capabilities are supported within ePay?

Answer: E-check and ACH are different payment types, and they process through ePay. E-check is guaranteed processing that flows through Global Payments. ACH is an electronic payment that flows directly through the merchant and the merchant's bank. The specific transactions supported are described in the ePay Payment Services Specifications document located in the Resource Room.

10. What languages are the ePay client APIs coded in?

Answer: Please refer to the ePay Payment Services Specifications documents located in the Resource Room.

11. According to information about ePay released in 2001, the data for the "State Data Daily Trans File" is "pushed" to the Controller of Public Accounts. Please confirm that is the process used today.

Answer: This is confirmed.

12. We understand that the Council on Competitive Government has an initiative related to the "Provisioning of State Geographic Information Services - Imagery and Data Set Acquisition" and that the Council intends to issue an RFO related to this initiative in December of 2009. Please provide a status of that procurement, as well as a description of the impact this may have on TexasOnline 2.0.

Answer: Vendors should contact the Council on Competitive Government (CCG) regarding the status of CCG procurements, or refer to the CCG website at: <http://www.ccg.state.tx.us/>. The impact of that procurement on TexasOnline 2.0 is not known. DIR will work collaboratively with the CCG to take advantage of the GIS offering but the impact or timeline cannot be determined until that contract is in place.

13. In Section 2.6.3 Application Service Levels, the RFO states "The Vendor will be required to work with DIR to define application service levels for TexasOnline 2.0. The service levels between the State and the Vendor will include at a minimum: (1) Online application availability and reliability, (2) Online application responsiveness, (3) Problem response, (4) Problem circumvention or resolution time, and (5) Application service level monitoring and reporting." We are reviewing the application availability statistics included in the Operations Report. Does the Current Contractor track or provide metrics on the



**Department of Information Resources
TexasOnline 2.0
Request for Offer DIR-TXO-001**

Addendum #5

suggested service levels outside of application availability? If so, could the State share that information?

Answer: The Current Contractor does not track or provide metrics on the suggested service levels outside of application availability.

14. In order for us to develop a matching format and facilitate a smooth integration with the State's current budgeting process and procedures, please provide the format of a template used in the current budgeting process, or a prior period example.

Answer: The 2008 Budget is provided in a new Appendix: F.13 and may be found at: <http://www1.dir.state.tx.us/tol/rfo/appendices.htm>.

15. Are there any end users of the portal (businesses, citizens or customers) that are billed directly by physical invoice and permitted to remit payment within a specified period of time? Are lockbox operations used? It does not appear so from Figures 3.2.2.1 and 3.2.2.2, but we would like the State to confirm our understanding.

Answer: Customers who are billed receive a direct debit to their bank account (Treasury) from the processors. Texas Parks and Wildlife Department receives an invoice from the processors for their monthly credit card fees. The Current Contractor generates monthly invoices to certain Customers to collect fees.

Lockbox operations are not used for TexasOnline ePay applications.

16. With regards to Figure 3.2.2.1, is the CPA (USAS) responsible for reconciling credit card chargeback and ACH returns or is that the responsibility of the Vendor?

Answer: Customers are responsible for reconciling chargeback and returns.

17. Within the Fiscal Policies and Procedures for Electronic Processing of Revenues and Expenditures document, a policy for "Local funds" is provided and states: "Online processing of revenue and expenditures transacted outside the State Treasury should be accounted for but not reported in USAS. This includes institutions of higher education with authority to receive and maintain convenience fees outside the State Treasury."

- Does this policy also extend to local governmental entities?
- How is the flow of funds associated with local funds different than the flow of funds provided within the RFO, which designates the CPA as the account that all funds deposit to and are disbursed from?
- To what account do the local funds deposit?
- May the Vendor propose other possible alternates to the flow of funds presented here?

Answer: Yes, the policy for "local funds" includes local governmental entities. These funds deposit to bank accounts designated by the local government entity.



**Department of Information Resources
TexasOnline 2.0
Request for Offer DIR-TXO-001**

Addendum #5

BearingPoint includes some local funds on the CPA transaction file for the three agencies that post to the Texas Safekeeping Trust Company. The transactions do not post to USAS, but they are sent to the Comptroller.

The Vendor may propose alternatives to the flow of funds. An alternate flow of funds proposal is subject to the approval of DIR and the CPA.

18. We are requesting that DIR grant a two-week extension for submission of the offers. We have reviewed the revised table 4.3.1 included in Amendment #4 and understand that the amended submission date is January 8, 2008. As part of the second round of questions, we have asked several questions necessary for our response. We will receive the State's detailed information on December 15, leaving the bidder 25 calendar days and 16 business days to integrate the detailed information provided by the State into our proposal. Given the volume of information to be provided by the State as part of this second round, we ask that DIR consider a two-week extension for proposal submission, making the proposal due on January 22, 2008. We feel that this additional two-week extension would benefit DIR because it would give the bidder additional time to incorporate the new information, resulting in a comprehensive proposal that thoroughly addresses all requirements and gives DIR a true sense of how we plan to deploy all phases of the project.

Answer: The deadline for submitting Offers has been extended to January 15, 2009 at 2:00 p.m. (CST) in this Addendum #5.

19. One of the requirements for the five mandatory client references is to identify "staff assigned to engagement that are proposed to work on this project, including their roles and responsibilities." Please confirm that "this project" refers to TexasOnline 2.0.

Answer: This is confirmed.

20. Page 25 of Appendix F.1(B) Monthly Financial Report August 2007 refers to costs for "ESB infrastructure" and "ESB software". Please provide the following information regarding this line item:

- What is the ESB software that was utilized?
- Is this ESB for a specific project?
- Related to a previous question, will an incoming Vendor be provided with the infrastructure and licenses to support this component?

Answer: The ESB software utilized is Oracle SOA Suite. This software is used for the Master Work Order Projects, specifically work order(s) CBA and Drivers License Renewal. MWO assets will transfer to DIR at MWO breakeven or August 31, 2012.

21. Page 22 of Appendix F.1(B) Monthly Financial Report May 2008 refers to costs associated with "Webtrends Server Upgrade". Please provide the following information regarding this line item:



Department of Information Resources
TexasOnline 2.0
Request for Offer DIR-TXO-001

Addendum #5

- Is Webtrends TexasOnline's web analytics tool?
- Related to a previous question, will an incoming Vendor be provided with the current licenses and infrastructure to support this tool?

Answer: Yes, TexasOnline uses Webtrends. This tool, subject to the existing license agreement, will transfer to the new Agreement.

22. Please provide relevant licensing information that the State has for unified message, collaboration tools or instant message products that could be used by the Vendor to price a solution?

Answer: There are no tools currently licensed for statewide use.

23. The following service names are listed in the August 2008 Operations Report but not listed in F7b. TXOAppsList.

- Are these services expected to be maintained by the Vendor?
 - Will they be subject to service levels and performance criteria?
- If yes to either question, please provide the cross reference to the corresponding service name in F7b.

• APPDPS02	• ECPTOTE PTOT Individual
• APPEFL01	• eDocs DB
• APPEFL02	• EDXEGV01
• APPEGV03	• EDXEGV02
• APPEGV04	• GPS Connection
• APPRTS01	• HAUSTVP1
• APPRTS02	• HAUSTVP2
• APPTEA01	• HWUSTVP1
• APPTEA02	• HWUSTVP2
• AT&T	• ISAEFL01
• Capnet	• ISAEFL02
• ChoicePoint	• OL Originals – MRT
• DALAPP01	• Originals Instance 14
• DALIMG01	• Originals Instance 15
• Dallas County RIIS	• PayGateway
• DALWEB01	• Profiling
• DBDAL01	• Rogers - CN Website
• DBEFL01	• SBC
• DBEFL02	• SOS Gateway
• DBTX01P1	• SPCB Business



Department of Information Resources
TexasOnline 2.0
Request for Offer DIR-TXO-001

Addendum #5

	Originals Deployment
• DBTX01P2	• SPCB Individual Originals Deployment
• DBUSTVP1	• Sprint
• DBUSTVP2	• TEA-LSPR
• DIR	• TEX-AN 2000
• DPS CHL	• Texas A&M
• DPS Gateway	• TexasOnline DB
• DSHS Instance 02 RCP – Originals	• TSBME Original NCT Instance 3
• DSHS Instance 03 MAS – Originals	• TSBME PIT Original
• DSHS Instance 05 - Renewals	• WBEFL01
• DSHS Instance 05 SWE – Originals	• WBEFL02
• DSHS Instance 07 – Originals	• WEBEGV07
• DSHS Instance 12 AVCS Haz – Originals	• WEBEGV08
• DSHS Instance 13 – Renewals	• WEBEGV09
• DSHS Tanning License Original	• ZAUSTVP1
• EAIINEFL01	• ZAUSTVP2
• EAIOUTEFL01	• ZWUSTVP1
• EAIOUTEFL02	• ZWUSTVP2
• ECPTOTE Facilities	
• ECPTOTE License Renewal	

Answer: The Vendor should base its Offer on the services described in Appendix F.7(b).

There may be additional services not provided in F.7(b) that can be identified during due diligence.

24. In the event of a BearingPoint bankruptcy:

Is the contract transferrable/saleable at BearingPoint's discretion?



**Department of Information Resources
TexasOnline 2.0
Request for Offer DIR-TXO-001**

Addendum #5

Would BearingPoint lose its position and bid in the RFP process?
Will the RFP process be changed?
Does Texas have the right to pursue and interim contractor to handle the ongoing management of the portal? and if so how is that award made?

Answer: This question is speculative and is outside the scope of this RFO.

25. In the event of a bankruptcy, we believe they may be unable to move transfer the project to another entity.

Does the Bearing Point contract with the State of Texas have a bankruptcy stipulation?

Would an outside contractor be invited to take over in the interim?

Would the terms of the TexasOnline portal RFP be delayed or altered?

Could Bearing Point bid?

Answer: With regard to the first sub-question, the Current Contract is available in RFO Appendix F.6. Each Vendor should consult with their business and legal advisors with regard to this issue.

The other sub-questions are speculative and are outside the scope of this RFO.

26. If a bidder is declared insolvent or bankrupt, or readjusts all of its obligations would that eliminate the bidder from contention?

Similarly, what would happen if your current service provider were deemed insolvent or bankrupt?

Answer: This question is speculative and is outside the scope of this RFO.

27. To assist in evaluating ePay and whether the Vendor will continue to use it, please provide information about its Payment Card Industry Data Security Standards (PCI DSS) Version 1.2 compliance. Specifically, does ePay store payment card data? If yes, what card data is stored, and what is the retention period for it?

Answer: ePay is PCI compliant. The available information is contained within the ePay Payment Services Specifications located in the Resource Room. Regarding specific storage elements and retention periods within ePay, DIR does not have access to this information.

End of Addendum #5